DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 592 EA 008 534

AUTHOR	Howard, Suzanne
TITLE	Why Aren't Women Administering Our Schools? The Status of Women Public School Teachers and the Factors Hindering Their Promotion Into Administration. "Wanted: More Women" Series.
INSTITUTION	National Council of Administrative Women in Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	54p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Council of Administrative Women in Education, 1815 Fort Myer Drive North, Arlington, Virginia 22209 ($3.00, quantity discounts)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Selection; *Discriminatory Attitudes (Social); *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Employment Statistics; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Federal Legislation; Leave of Absence; Principals; Sex Discrimination; *Sex Role; Sex Stereotypes; Social Attitudes; *Women Teachers

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the status of women in teaching and to examine the social attitudes that keep them out of administrative positions. Teaching is a 'female occupation', and the low status of teaching is inextricably linked to the sex-typing of occupations in general. However, even though the majority of all teachers are female, the majority of educational administrators are male. Women in education are discriminated against in salary matters, in maternity leaves of absence, and in other job-related benefit areas. Stereotypic social attitudes toward married women workers and toward women as administrators serve to prevent women from filling administrative jobs and restrict the advancement of the few who do hold such positions. Even though the research indicates no difference between men's and women's leadership abilities, many women feel incapable of administration or believe that they will be unhappy in an administrative job. Women are not recruited for such jobs, and they are less well prepared educationally than men to fill them. The schools must work in conjunction with all other social institutions to eradicate inequality in education. (Author/DS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED126592

NCAWE

EA 008 534

WHY AREN'T WOMEN ADMINISTERING OUR SCHOOLS?

Wanted: More Women

NCAWE

Why Aren't Women Administering Our Schools?

The Status of Women Public School Teachers and the Factors Hindering Their Promotion into Administration

Suzanne Howard

National Council of Administrative Women In Education

Additional copies are available from:
NCAWE
1815 Fort Myer Drive North
Arlington, Virginia 22209
Price: $3.00
Bulk rate available upon request.
Shipping charges included on prepaid cash orders;
orders not accompanied by cash will be billed
with shipping charges included.

Copyright © 1975 by National Council of Administrative Women in Education.
All Rights Reserved.
Printed in the United States of America
Design and Production: Jane Berman
Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 75-37003

Contents

FOREWORD 1
Shirley McCune

INTRODUCTION 3

THE STATUS OF WOMEN PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS 5

Power Structure 5
Sex-Typing between Occupations 5
Sex-Typing within Teaching 7
Sex-Ranking in Education 8
Salary Discrepancies 10
Maternity Leave and Job-Related Benefits 12
Present Policy 12
Citizens Advisory Council's Statement of Principles 14
Federal Legislation 16
Legal Remedies Supported by Teacher Organizations 18

THE SOCIOPSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS HINDERING THE PROMOTION OF WOMEN TO ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS 21

Attitudes toward Married Women Workers 21
Attitudes toward Women as Administrators 24
Attitudes toward the Leadership Skills of Women Administrators.. 25
Attitudes of Women toward Themselves 27
Recruitment Procedures 29
Negative Image of Administrators and "Career" 29

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION 33

For State and Local School Boards 33
For Colleges of Education 34

CONCLUSIONS 35

REFERENCES 39

TABLES AND FIGURES 47

ABOUT THE AUTHOR 53

Tables and Figures

TABLE 1	Total Number Of Classroom Teachers In Public Elementary And Secondary Schools, And Percent Of Men Teachers	47
TABLE 2	Percentage Distribution Of Elementary And Secondary Female Teachers By Position And Region, 1972-1973	48
TABLE 3	Percentage Distribution Of Principals And Assistant Principals By Sex, 1972-1973	49
TABLE 4	Percentage Distribution Of Female Administrators And Teachers By Position And Region	50
FIGURE 1	Official New York City Board Of Education Literature Used To Train Supervisors	51

Foreword

In 1975, approximately 75 of the nation's 17,000 school districts are directed by female superintendents of schools. Two percent of the nation's secondary school principals are women; eighteen percent of the nation's elementary school principals are women. In a profession where 63% of all public school instructional personnel is female, these figures suggest that a general pattern of sex role stereotyping exists in educational employment. In a field where women hold 20% of the master's degrees and 8.5% of the doctorates in educational administration, these figures also suggest the existence of sex discrimination in the education profession. Despite the efforts of a few districts to move more women into administrative roles, the national percentages of women in educational administration continue the pattern of steady decline which began more than fifteen years ago.

This decline of women in administrative roles in education is a major concern for public education and for our society. It is of particular importance now, at a time when our society is involved in the reevaluation of traditional sex roles and the limitations placed by sex role stereotypes upon the opportunities of women and men and to make maximum contributions to our society and to enjoy the full range of human experience.

Education must play a significant role in this societal reevaluation. Education in a changing society must, by definition, be dynamic and changing. If it is to prepare persons for participation in our society, our education system must model, reflect and shape our changing social goals and institutions. Equality of opportunity for all is a professed national goal. This goal can never be achieved unless our schools move toward its actualization. Our education system must reflect the full diversity of our society; it must obtain the full benefits of the abilities of the individuals working within it regardless of their sex, race, ethnicity or social class, if it is to assist all individuals in attaining their potential and in contributing fully to our society.

The lack of women in administrative roles affects the education provided for boys and girls within the classroom. Role modeling is a powerful form of learning. Students who never experience women in leadership positions or men working with young children are not likely to develop aspirations or values that move beyond traditional stereotypes.

Further, the lack of women in educational administration highlights a need for basic reform in the delivery of educational services. One issue in contemporary education involves a redefinition of the experiences necessary to prepare an effective administrator. One major role in educational administration is the provision of leadership in instructional and curriculum areas. This must be based upon an active working knowledge of the teaching-learning processes in the classroom. An administrator who is not grounded in classroom experience is unlikely to be able to provide necessary direction in the effective delivery of instructional services to students. For too long education has been largely characterized by a dual career-development model -- one track for administrators -- usually males, and one

track for instructors -- usually females, with little connection between the two. We must now begin to integrate these tracks, to recruit and prepare teachers, both male and female, to assume administrative roles that can provide the leadership necessary for the improvement of educational services. It is impossible to eliminate sexism in educational administration without a reconsideration of the relationship between teaching and administration.

The following analysis of the status of women public school teachers is an overview of the nature and manifestations of sex role stereotyping and sex discrimination in educational employment and the changes that are necessary for their elimination. It provides documentation of the prevalence of sex discrimination and sex role stereotyping in the education profession and delineates issues which we must consider if we are to effect needed educational reform. Until we have modified the attitudes, practices and policies that limit the effective development and movement of women into administrative roles, we can never achieve equality for our children, our schools or our society.

Shirley McCune
Program Coordinator
Resource Center on
Sex Roles in Education
National Foundation for
The Improvement of Education
Washington, D.C.

I think that only where women do not play their sex roles as helpers and adjuncts, that is, where they stop being closet intellectuals, closet professionals, closet geniuses, and decision-makers, they have a chance to come into their own, and out of the sex-role situation which makes them *by definition* and not objective standard, second class, second rank and second rate.

CYNTHIA F. EPSTEIN

Introduction

When our principal wrote: "Hire only male teachers if at all possible," we two feminist teachers complained. Both of us were given unsatisfactory ratings and forced transfers to other schools after 12 and 8 years, respectively, of satisfactory teaching. Despite overwhelming evidence establishing our competency, the Board of Education confirmed the ratings. Rather than disciplining the principal, the Board furnished him with a free lawyer when we sued in court. When we won damages against him personally, the Chancellor made the motion--passed by acclamation--to pay our monetary awards from the principal's own salary.

I was chief picketeer in the nine week strike in 1968. My principal was highly critical of my behavior and looked for a way to get me. While doing calesthentics with my all-girl senior gym class, my leotard accidentally ripped. My principal accused me of exposing myself in front of the class. He ordered a forced psychiatric examination which, to my astonishment, I lost. My license was taken on the spot. After 26 years of teaching, my career was finished in a day with no procedure to appeal the decision.*

These case histories, taken from the files of Mary McAuley, are representative of frequently heard accounts of discriminatory practices in the New York City schools. These may not apply elsewhere. However, New York City has the reputation of being the most advanced in its protection of teachers. It takes about one year and a half to get rid of a tenured teacher. Because sex discrimination is illegal, most administrators use other excuses to terminate contracts.

Teachers United for Fair Treatment (TUFT) has been organized by McAuley to encourage, advise, and support other teachers who wish to challenge sexist laws and prevailing practices. Her group is discussing how teachers protest

*From correspondence with Mary McAuley, President, TUFT, January 27, 1974. (See also 27:10; 42:7).

at the risk of their jobs, for there is no one at the Board of Education to whom they may appeal when their Constitutional and procedural due process guarantees are flagrantly violated. "We women teachers are cast as losers and expected to play our role" (41:11).

Educational institutions across the country are currently under fire for treating teachers as second-class citizens. The purpose of this monograph is to analyze the status of women in teaching, and to examine the social attitudes that keep them in their place. Based on the belief that discriminatory policies and practices are no longer to be tolerated, recommendations for remedial action will be made.

The Status of Women Public School Teachers

Power Structure

Sex-Typing between Occupations

Sex-typing of occupations occurs in all societies. Some occupations are known as "male," others are "female," and some are not assigned to one sex or the other. Only 10 percent of American occupations are held by both men *and* women, the remainder are filled predominantly by men *or* women (cited in 15:24).

In the United States all professions are sex-typed. Nurses, social workers, and teachers are overwhelmingly women; law, medicine, the ministry, and engineering are male professions. Whatever the work, if it is done by men, it tends to be more highly regarded. "Men rank first in the ranking of the sexes and they get the first-ranking jobs. Women rank second and lowest and get the second- and lowest-ranking jobs" (17:162).

Teaching is a "female occupation." This has not always been the case. In colonial and pioneer days men filled the positions of primary school teaching. With the shortage of men at the time of the Civil War women were recruited. The fact that women were anxious to get out of the home and enter the labor force accounted for their willingness to work for half the wage of men. Women eventually predominated in the field and with this shift came the labelling of teaching as a low status profession, sometimes referred to as a semi-profession (72). Women constitute 66.4 percent of the nation's public school teachers, according to a 1973 survey of the National Education Association (NEA) (57). Although teaching has long been considered a "woman's field,"

the number of men entering the profession has been increasing (see Table 1), and this may bring another change in image. In the last 10 years the number of men teachers increased at a rate of 59 percent while women teachers increased only 37 percent. The most dramatic increase has been at the secondary level --a 67 percent increase in male teachers in the last decade. In the same period, the increase in the elementary schools was 39 percent (54:13). School officials, professional educators, and parents agree that there should be even more male teachers (53:45; 12:292-293; 30). The desire for increasing the number of men stems from the prevalent lore that the heavy predominance of women in our schools causes our male students to be "feminized" (71). It is believed that the male teacher will provide a father figure, which, in turn, will improve the pupils' learning experiences, and decrease discipline problems (89:75; 12:293). More importantly, many educators feel that teaching will not become a leading profession until the proportion of men to women is drastically increased (30:60).

Attempts to recruit more men often lead to discriminatory hiring practices. It is not unusual for school districts to announce openings for "male teachers" to placement bureaus. An Oregon school district wrote to a male applicant: "Our immediate elementary openings in all probability will be filled with candidates who are men" (22:18). Women are often asked questions irrelevant to the teaching skills required.* "Are you planning to get married?" Married women are asked, "Does your husband plan to establish himself permanently in this area?" "Do you plan to have any children?" If not, "Are you taking any precautions?" A young man gets an entirely dif-

---

*According to guidelines on sex discrimination in employment issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), any questions on marital status directed at women applicants must also be directed at male applicants and the same employment decisions must result (3).

ferent set of questions: "Are you interested in becoming an administrator?" "How long do you intend to teach before becoming a principal?" "Are you interested in coaching so you can pick up some extra money?" Thus, individuals may evaluate and recommend women as highly as men, but when confronted with the actual task of hiring, males are often preferred over females.

The status of teaching is inextricably linked to the sex-typing of occupations in general. Men are not only gradually infiltrating the teaching profession, but other female occupations as well, e.g., nursing administration, social work, library science. However, while female occupations have become less segregative, or more open about including males, male occupations continue to be resistant to female entry (25:205). It may be argued that sex-typing of occupations gets in the way of finding the best qualified person for the job. What is needed to reduce sex-typing in education is not greater inducements to bring men into the profession (higher salaries) but rather a broadening of alternatives for women. As opportunities for entry into *all* occupations at *all* levels of responsibility open up, the energies of women will become less focused on teaching, and the profession will be less dominated by women (30:60-61).

Sex-Typing within Teaching

Sex-typing of jobs also exists within the schools. Women are clustered in certain fields, men in others. In high school, math, science and the social sciences are generally taught by men, while there are more women in English and foreign languages. In vocational, commercial, and industrial arts classes as well as in physical education men instruct the boys while women teach the girls (quoted in 25:207). In analyzing extra-duty assignments in the Dayton public schools, it was found that only 4 women held positions as secondary

vocal music, orchestra or band directors while all but two cheerleaders/ drill team sponsors were female. In varsity sports women constituted only 20 percent of the coaching staffs and then may coach only girls' teams. Men make up 71 percent of the elementary safety patrol advisors (85:4-5).

Sex-Ranking in Education

Another form that segregation takes is stratificational, where men become the supervisors, or take over the more prestigious positions within the occupation. Within the education profession the majority of the females are fixed in the helper and service roles where they are responsible for carrying out decisions of their supervisors, or are themselves responsible for lower-level decision-making. Wherever you look in schools, women abound in the lower ranks and do not move on to independent and command roles (17:4).

Status and prestige in teaching are related to the age of the children being taught. Thus, high school teachers are usually regarded as "being somewhat higher in the social system of the school than are elementary teachers" (quoted in 20:2). Whenever teachers or administrators move up in the system it is usually from the elementary level to the secondary, and not vice-versa. According to NEA, men have been concentrated at the high school level since 1957-58. About 2 out of 3 male teachers are in high school (87:75), and men are now a slight majority (53.6 percent) of the teaching population at that level (58:20). In 1972-73 women still made up 83.5 percent of the elementary teaching force (58:29). Information obtained on the percentage of female teachers at the elementary and secondary levels in state and local school districts reflect the national trend, as indicated in Table 2. The same phenomena occurs in administration. The higher the level of the school, the greater the number of male principals and assistant principals (see Table 3).

Climbing the career ladder in education means getting out of the classroom. Teachers who wish to advance in education must leave teaching and move into administration. In New York City having out-of-class assignments (e.g., assistant to an administrator, grade advisor, hall patrol) gives a teacher status, a title, and a much lighter teaching load. Most of these positions are held by men and are the first step in getting jobs with real power and authority (41:1-3). *Despite the fact that women far outnumber men in the teaching profession, few advance into administrative positions and their number has been steadily declining.*

National Statistics on Women in Administration. A recent national survey pointed up the fact that although women constitute a majority of the teaching force, only 13.5 percent of the nation's principals are female, down from 37 percent in 1960. Of the 13,037 superintendents, only .1 percent are female, a decline from 90 to 65 in the past decade (57:9). A 1970 survey of superintendents, sponsored by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), revealed that of all the largest school districts in the United States not one was headed by a woman (36:21). Since that time the Washington, D.C. school district has distinguished itself by firing a female superintendent, Barbara Sizemore. In the same survey only three females held the reins in the next biggest districts. It is in the small rural districts that one finds the largest proportion of female superintendents, and even here they account for a meager 8.5 percent.

Even in the realm where women predominate, the ratio of women elementary principals has been diminishing in the last 20 years (48:4; 57:9). In recent years women have almost been eliminated entirely from public secondary school administration. Between 1950-51 and 1961-62, the 12 percent women junior high and 6 percent senior high principals sank to 3.8 percent for all secondary schools (48:4). Today only 2.9 percent of the junior high

principals and 1.4 percent of the senior high principals are women (57:9).

State and Local Statistics on Women in Administration. A comparison of the information obtained on women in educational administration in various states and local districts confirms the national pattern of male leadership (see Table 4). Only the data for New York City show a higher level of female participation than the national averages. As more and more state and local reports are published, it is becoming apparent that the low number of women in administrative posts in schools is a reflection of prevailing discriminatory practices and policies in a large number of the nation's schools.

Having looked at the distribution of power in the whole profession over the past few decades, we recognize that men are clearly gaining a disproportionate share of control. To summarize these data, in the field of education women *predominate* in numbers, men *dominate* in power.

Salary Discrepancies

The NEA reports that despite annual salary increases the teacher's economic position relative to the rest of the economy has declined in recent years (56:16). It is not surprising that since teaching is considered "women's work" the salaries of teachers are lower than earnings for other professions (14:399).

The same sex bias of the culture which considers teaching a second rate profession is also reflected in the rewards of the teaching profession. Teachers' salaries may vary from school system to school system, but there is a single salary schedule within each system. This means that for the same training and experience the salary must be the same for all people in that classification of positions. Researchers, however, have found that male teachers generally receive more income than women (30:57). The mean annual contract salaries for men teachers in the public schools is $10,636 compared

to $9,370 for women (59:2). The reasons for salary differences are not fully understood. However, part of the discrepancies may be due to discriminatory allotments of salary supplements.

Salary Supplements. An NEA survey shows that most salary supplements go to men for coaching boys' intramural sports. Many school boards give minimal or no supplements at all to women who coach girls' teams, or who direct other activities, such as Glee Club (cited in 68:409). According to the Connecticut Education Association in 1971-72, extra-duty pay for atheltic activities in that state ranged from an average low of $264 to a high of $1160 for coaching male sports (10). Female coaches received supplements which ranged from an average minimum of $200 to a maximum average of $467.

Men tend to be concentrated in school systems, grade levels, and fields which pay more. The average salaries of elementary school teachers are lower than those of secondary teachers (59:2). Moreover, census data show that male remuneration is greater at every position level--and this disparity widens as positions rise. The average salary for 80,000 male school administrators in 1970 was $13,625. Female administrators received an average of almost $5,000 less (cited in 79:125). In the suburbs of Chicago where some of the nation's most respected school districts are situated, statistics released on Cook County administrators indicate that although female staff members had slightly more years of experience than the males, the average salary is $20,187 for males, $16,788 for females (11:23).

Women, who constitute a majority of the public education teaching profession, are denied equal status, equal pay, and equal opportunity for advancement. They clearly rank lower than men on the continuum of desirability as educational leaders. Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, a leading sociologist, points out that what is curious about the status of women in the work world is that

even in the so-called "female occupations," they are confronted with the same obstacle course to the top as are women who enter the male-dominated professions (18:3). "Where men constitute a minority in an occupation, they seem to have a better chance to do well and be upwardly mobile" (17:152).

Maternity Leave and Job-Related Benefits

Present Policy

Another way schools keep a woman in her place and remind her of her limitations is by forcing her to disappear quietly once her condition of pregnancy becomes apparent--usually in the fourth or fifth month. Mandatory maternity leave is probably one of the most blatant discriminatory policies in the schools today. The required leave policy is left over from the last century when pregnant women were discouraged from being seen in public, much less teaching school. When the Victorian attitude that pregnant teachers were obscene and not fit to be viewed by children began to fade, the school insisted that the ruling was for the protection of women's own physical well-being. Too many school districts--the majority--have not gotten around to revising their antiquated policies.

Most contract requirements ask for extremely long advance notice of the conditions of pregnancy. Teachers in some school systems, after being forced to take leave at the end of the fourth or fifth month, are required to remain on leave from three months to a full year. Although childbirth is merely a temporary medical disability, some regulations give teachers no employment rights at all; these teachers are unable to return under the same conditions with accrued benefits. Some school systems refuse to reinstate teachers after the birth of their child. Mandatory prevention of return is, in effect, an enforced layoff, and sometimes dismissal without due process. Sometimes they are reemployed only if there is a suitable vacancy. The NEA reports that requiring pregnant teachers to resign their positions, whether

or not they are tenured, is a device occasionally used by school boards to get rid of teachers who do not conform to community mores or who exercise free-expression rights (51:34). As school budgets are decreased, forced resignations of pregnant teachers enable school boards to reduce their faculties without adherence to appropriate procedures. Some school systems will rehire teachers only if they agree to denial of tenure and other accumulated rights. Other discriminatory practices include not being able to return to the same school, the same program, the same desk, or having to substitute. Mandatory leave policies or policies in which married women with children are not hired at all are based on the prevailing myth that children of non-working mothers are better adjusted than those of working mothers (6).

The vast majority of married women with children who work do so for serious economic reasons, not just for pin-money. Only a few work for self-fulfillment (81). Forced maternity leave for women results in serious financial hardship due to loss of wages, seniority rights, and fringe benefits (74:182). Obstetricians have testified that a set period of forced retirement before and after birth is "medically unjustifiable" and that, in fact, working mothers may be far better off physically and psychologically if they remain on the job throughout their pregnancies (26:5). Statistics show that approximately 30 percent of the pregnant women work outside of the home with no ill effects (74:182).

The NEA argues that forcing a teacher to leave her job when only a few months pregnant, regardless of whether it interferes with her ability to teach, not only deprives a woman of her livelihood and her desire to pursue her chosen profession, but also disrupts the education of her students. Laws prohibiting women from working before and after pregnancy discriminate against women because their aim and effect is to regulate women's employment and not

to regulate or give benefits for pregnancy and childbirth. School boards continue to enforce policies based on their own notions about how pregnant women should live. The reproductive differences in the sexes are not relevant to employment. In this as in all areas of employment, men and women must be treated the same (16:312-313).

Citizens' Advisory Council's Statement of Principles

The Citizen's Advisory Council on the Status of Women (established in 1963; members appointed by the President) is one of the first organizations to study the subject of mandatory leave policies in depth. They concluded (1970) that *maternity leave* should be defined as that period of time when a woman is unable to perform her job because of childbirth or complications of pregnancy. To avoid semantic confusion, the term *childbirth leave* has also been adopted.

The Council proceeds from the belief that maternity leave is a matter of individual choice, and that each women, in consultation with her doctor, will determine how long she will be off for childbirth (26:4). A woman teacher in the Northeast reports that in her district a pregnant teacher is required to pull her dress taut and parade around the assistant superintendent's office periodically during her pregnancy. He (and he alone) decides if and for how long she may continue her employment (77:60). Marjorie Stern, Chairperson of the Committee for Women's Rights, American Federation of Teachers says, "They [teachers] should not have to report who, what, why, when, where, and how they got pregnant . . . " (75).

In 1970 the Council adopted a forceful Statement of Principles, suggesting that childbirth and complications of pregnancy be treated as temporary disabilities by employers and health insurers. In effect, what this

means is that the school should look upon a female employee's pregnancy no differently from a male employee's injury, surgery or other temporary physical incapacity. Traditionally teachers who are absent due to illness draw pay until their accumulated sick leave days are exhausted. May a pregnant woman take her leave as accumulated sick leave pay? Usually not. Sometimes such absences are excluded from sick-leave plans or included with special limitations (23:14-15). How should a maternity leave be handled? The Council argues that if a school district permits an employee to use accumulated sick leave days and receive salary while recovering from an operation, the school should also permit the pregnant teacher to use the sick leave days she has earned while she is away from work to deliver her child.

Do teachers receive maternity benefits in their job-related health insurance plans? Sometimes yes, sometimes with special limitations, or not at all. Many employers will now agree that women should not be forced to quit their jobs or be required to be off work for a specific period after childbirth, and that they are entitled to their reemployment rights, but they do object to providing full insurance coverage, as provided for other disabilities. They assume it will greatly increase their costs. According to estimates of one of the largest underwriters of group health insurance in the nation (26:6-10), the cost of treating maternity as a temporary disability for employers with no present health insurance coverage would be minimal (about a 10 percent increase), and would be even less for an employer who now has limited coverage. The Council objects to discriminatory favorable treatment for pregnant teachers as well as discrimination against these workers (37:481-482). What this means is that no pregnant teacher should be in a better position in relation to job-related benefits than an employee suffering from any other disability. Council Chairperson Gutwillig has point out

that it is very important not to provide benefits that would discourage employers from hiring women of child-bearing age. "We did not want to damage women's opportunities for employment under the guise of protecting them" (quoted in 37:497).

Denying teachers sick leave pay and hospital coverage for reasons of childbirth and temporary disability for complications is in the nature of a "reverse benefit" or a punishment. The *reason* for the absence, whether due to childbirth, injury, surgery or other temporary physical incapacity should be of no concern to the employer. To single out absence for the particular reason of childbirth bears no employment purpose other than to discriminate against certain women workers. The argument is often encountered that since pregnancy is voluntary, it should be excluded from health insurance, sick leave, and temporary disability insurance plans. However, pregnancy is not always voluntary. Even when it is--to deny maternity benefits to women is discrimination against the only sex capable of experiencing that condition . . . women. The essence of equal opportunity is to treat women and men as individuals, not as classes.

The Council treats the topic of *child rearing* leave as a separate issue. While only women have children, *both* parents are capable of staying home to raise them. The Association of American Colleges recommends to employers that parents of either sex should be eligible for unpaid leaves of absence for child-rearing purposes, granted and limited by the same policies and procedures as in the case of personal leaves for other reasons (2).

Federal Legislation

Until 3 years ago, the federal government offered no protection to women teachers seeking legal redress against discriminatory policies and

practices. Today, federal legislation makes this possible. More specifically, the following laws and orders may be used: Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972, Executive Orders 11246 and 11375, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Equal Pay Act--all of which require educational institutions receiving federal funds to avoid differential treatment on the basis of sex.

The Citizens' Advisory Council's recommendations on pregnancy and childbirth have been followed in the guidelines on sex discrimination issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (1972) which enforces Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (19). The 1972 Amendment to that Act extended coverage to include employees of public and private educational institutions. Consequently, each school district is under legal obligation to comply with the EEOC guidelines. As outlined by the Council in 1970, the guidelines state that pregnant workers are generally entitled to maternity leave with the rights to reinstatement in the same or in a similar position and salary with no loss of employment benefits. The determination of the length of time an employee will require for maternity leave is a medical decision between a woman and her physician to be treated in the same way as any other temporary disability. To require 2 years of employment before allowing maternity leave has been held in violation of the Equal Pay Act (amended to cover educational employees in 1972) where leaves of absence and disability leaves are not subject to any similar requirement (49:18). According to EEOC interpretation, employer's insurance plans which accord maternity benefits only to those employees who have head-of-household status are in violation of Title VII. This insurance specification has resulted in discrimination against women in that the employer assumes that married female teachers are covered by their husbands' policies. Thus, it is unlawful to

make benefits available to wives of male teachers while female teachers receive no such benefits or with special limitations (e.g., 2 years of employment required for eligibility) (3). The EEOC Guidelines represent official recognition that employers must adjust to provide support, not penalty, for motherhood.

Legal Remedies Supported by Teacher Organizations

The battle to achieve full equal employment opportunities for women workers has not been won. The EEOC under Title VII has no power to enforce its guidelines. While these guidelines do not have the force of law, however, they constitute the Commission's interpretation of the law, and have been upheld in the courts. Federal and state courts are now ruling that situations involving forced maternity leave, loss of retirement and salary benefits, endangered tenure and seniority rights, and inequitable policies relating to reemployment after childbirth are contrary to the equal protection rights under the Fourteenth Amendment (51:35). Since 1970, a number of significant federal and state court decisions have favored teachers who challenge school board policies which require teachers to take leave early in pregnancy (62).

The year 1974 is the breakthrough year in the U.S. for female teachers to bear children without penalty in employment. On January 21, 1974 in a precedent setting decree, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down mandatory maternity leave provisions set by school boards (52). The Supreme Court ruled 7-2 that mandatory leave-of-absence policies, regardless of an individual's ability to work, violated the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of due process of law.* The high court concluded that the rationales school boards provided

*The Supreme Court heard and ruled jointly on two conflicting cases involving Cleveland teachers, Jo Carol LaFleur and Ann Elizabeth Nelson, and Virginia teacher, Susan Cohen.

for maternity leave policies--the necessity of firm cut-off dates for instructional continuity, relief of administrative problems, and the avoidance of disabling effects of physical incidents associated with pregnancy--cannot justify the sweeping maternity leave regulations. The court pointed out that...

> As long as the teacher is required to give substantial advance notice of her condition, the choice of firm dates later in pregnancy would serve the boards' objectives just as well, while imposing a far lesser burden on the women's exercise of constitutionally protected freedom (52:2).

The legal and financial support for these Supreme Court cases as well as others at various court levels have largely been provided by the NEA Du Shane Emergency Fund. Although NEA has pioneered the fight on the maternity leave and sex discrimination issues on many fronts, the American Federation of Teachers is also committed to eliminating discriminatory practices against women in employment, personnel policies, compensation, and promotion.

It is clear that federal laws, executive orders or regulations are insufficient to bringing about change. Citizen's groups concerned with human rights will have to (1) push the federal government for strong enforcement of Title IX, and (2) monitor local school boards and districts to see that they comply with the regulations. Women need to continue to challenge school boards' special regulations regarding length of absence for childbirth and child rearing and the exclusion of childbirth from all group health, temporary disability insurance or sick leave plans--so teachers will no longer be required to choose between the right to work and the right to bear and raise children.

The Sociopsychological Factors Hindering the Promotion of Women to Administrative Positions

In the preceding section, we have discussed pay and status differentials. The current situation raises a number of questions. Do women lack the motivation necessary for an administrative position? Are women interested in obtaining the training necessary for assuming a position of leadership? Are women incapable of being good administrators? Or is it that women prefer to teach? Are they being held back by male administrators? What obstacles or problems interfere with their efforts or desires for promotion? Let us now consider the societal attitudes, the discriminatory policies and practices, and womens' own attitudes about themselves which act as roadblocks to their advancement in the profession.

Attitudes toward Married Women Workers

Richard and Ida Simpson argue that women are more interested in fulfilling their sex roles than following a career, whereas men enter the field of teaching in search of a lifetime commitment (72:217).* Behind this is the belief that women will only get married, have children, and drop out of the work force.

In the past many women have followed the tradition of quitting work when they became mothers. However, more recent studies reflect changing career expectations and work patterns (80; 83; 70; 44). The more typical

*This argument overlooks the point that commitment to a lifetime occupation is fulfillment of the male sex role.

career pattern of women today is characterized by initial entry, interruption for child-bearing and/or rearing of children, and reentry a few years later. It cannot be denied that women have been unlike men in the discontinuity of their work participation. In a study of the career patterns of husbands and wives who were professionals, Holmstrom found that as many men as women had interrupted their careers--but for different reasons (33:521). The men were away from work for military service, the women to raise children. Holstrom points out how employers often perceive those interruptions differently.

> In a curious paradox of human values men have been criticized only slightly for career interruptions in which their task was to kill off other members of the human race; but women have been severely criticized for taking time away from their profession in order to raise the next generation (33:521).

In any case, NEA reports that broken service is rarer among teachers than it used to be (55:11). In the last decade the number who had had at least one break in service had dropped from more than half of all women teachers to a third. Women are devoting less time to child-rearing and returning to work after shorter intervals (69). Thus, the argument that women should not be promoted to positions of leadership because they abandon their profession to raise children is outmoded.

It is then argued that the interrupted career pattern of married female teachers gives the male a lead on experience--which is why men are promoted (7:10). Evidence from research suggests the contrary. Men advance *faster* with *less* experience simply because they are men. Hoyle and Randall found that 67 percent of the male principals had *less* than 6 years of elementary classroom experience prior to promotion while 88 percent of the females became principals *after* 6 or more years of elementary teaching (cited in 45:4). Gross and Trask found that as many as 34 percent of the male prin-

cipals in their study had never taught in an elementary school while only 3 percent of women principals did not have this experience (cited in 45:4). In addition, the rare women who do break into administration are less likely to continue to move up. Results of an 8-year study on promotions in the San Diego secondary schools reveal that of a total of 76 administrators, 63 men and only 13 women were promoted. It was reported that of the assistant principals surveyed 14 women but only 2 men were still holding the same assignment or one of equal status to that held 8 years earlier (50:2).

Related to the traditional attitude that "a woman's place is in the home" is the belief that due to limitations imposed by children there will be a higher absenteeism and turnover rate among working mothers (43:202; 77:61).

According to Annual Public Health Service surveys, men and women lose about the *same* amount of time from work due to illness and injury, including childbirth and pregnancy (9:4). In 1969 the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor found that attendance and turnover were influenced more by the skill level of the job, the age of the worker, the worker's record of job stability, and the length of service with the employer than by the mere fact of the sex of the worker. A study of occupational mobility showed that men changed jobs more frequently than women (76:33). Thus, unsubstantiated beliefs based on traditional images of women as mothers allow employers to justify offering women lower salaries, fewer promotions, and fewer incentives than men.

There is some empirical support for the beliefs that women do tend to work fewer hours and to drop out of their profession to a greater extent. How can this phenomenon be explained? Epstein argues that commitment varies with the openness of the opportunity structure, that there is a higher turnover among those placed low in the stratification hierarchy of occupations.

Doubt as to whether one's achievement will be recognized in the profession undermines motivation (18:2). Because women often receive little or no encouragement or incentive in their careers they often use marriage or maternity as excuses for quitting their jobs. Prather points out that this practice perpetuates the self-fulfilling prophecy that women really would rather remain at home than pursue a career (66:179).

We must face the fact that women are joining the labor force not at the expense of marrying but along with it, and increasingly expect to combine marriage and a career (29; 64). "For all of these women it is not only (or perhaps not even primarily) their lack of motivation that prevents their career advancement so much as it is the institutionalized assumptions concerning the normalcy of marriage, motherhood, and the inevitability of withdrawal from the labor force" (76:32).

Although there may be valid grounds for some of the generalizations about working women, it is time to investigate further if these are really valid or if they are merely accepted without facing up to the changing lifestyles of men and women. Generalized statements become part of a myth system used to make predictions and decisions about individuals on the basis of their sex rather than on their personal qualities and skills. No matter how true the generalization it is always necessary to allow for individual differences. We can no longer build our teaching and administrative forces on the assumption that men will work until retirement and women only until they marry. There are too many exceptions.

Attitudes toward Women as Administrators

Another factor hindering the promotion of women into administrative positions is the widespread belief that women do not want to work for another woman and that men resent a woman as their immediate superior. Grounds

for these common assertions are frequently cited but they have not yet been sufficiently substantiated (72:225-28; 43:202). Evidence from several research studies in the past decade show that: 1) the favorable attitudes of female teachers in the school systems surveyed explode the myth that women do not wish to work for a female administrator; 2) the neutral to favorable attitudes of male teachers would not represent a hindrance to the appointment of women administrators; 3) teachers as a group are more favorable toward a female administrator than superintendents and school board members; and, 4) attitudes are more positive when both men and women have had experience working for a female administrator (cited in 188:31-34; cited in 78:46-48; 60:4). Additional research in these areas is needed to determine what other factors contribute to a negative stance towards women administrators and how the less favorable attitudes of male teachers, male and female administrators, and board members may be changed.

Attitudes toward the Leadership Skills of Women Administrators

Attitude surveys indicate that preferential hiring of males is based on the belief that men are more effective administrators for social and psychological reasons (cited in 78:41-43; 44). Several research studies conducted in the '50's and '60's indicate there is little substantiated evidence for the notion that men perform better the leadership role of the principalship. Results of a Florida study as well as the findings of a follow-up one year later showed that women operated democratically more often than men (cited in 48:21; 28:13). When parents were invited to rate the schools' effectiveness and the principals' qualities, the schools with women principals tended to outrank those with men.

The Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederiksen research conducted on a nationwide basis further substantiated the Florida Leadership findings.

Administrators and teachers rated women principals higher than men on on-the-job performance (cited in 48:22). Additional research supports the position that women succeed as educational administrators. Gross and Trask found that the performance of teachers was better and student achievement was higher in schools administered by women principals (cited in 45:12). Hoyle and Randall reported that teachers described female administrators as noticing potential problem situations and as evaluating results of action significantly more often than male administrators (cited in 45). Morsink showed that male principals outscored women principals on only *one* dimension of leadership behavior, tolerance of freedom (46). Since the findings showed that women principals received higher scores on *all* other dimensions of leader behavior, Morsink states that there is no justification for the argument that men are better suited than women to the task of the secondary school principalship.

In spite of the fact that men occupy 86.5 percent of the public school principalships, evidence from the studies presented indicates there is probably no reason to believe that women are less effective than men as elementary and secondary principals. Further research investigating these relationships appears warranted. What is clear is that no matter how excellent the qualifications and job performance, a woman's opportunities for career advancement are influenced by the attitudes of society toward her role as a woman. The research findings suggest that in hiring principals we need to decide what leadership attributes and skills are appropriate, so nominees may be selected on the basis of these rather than on preconceived notions as to which sex possesses the necessary qualifications.

Attitudes of Women toward Themselves

Self-Image. While women are often the victims of discriminatory attitudes on the part of society in general reinforced by actual discriminatory practices, this is not the whole story. A case can be made that women's lack of occupational success is not always due to discrimination. One of the most formidable barriers to women's full participation in educational leadership positions is their own lack of confidence. Because of "self-doubt, self-depreciation and a built-in bias about the inherent inferiority of women relative to men in decision-making and leadership," (32:11) many women see themselves as unable to perform effectively or to be happy in such roles. And as long as women feel incapable of doing the job or think they won't be happy, it is doubtful they will seek it (8:215).

Aspirations. Are women less likely to aspire to leadership roles as the level of responsibility increases? Mason found that 51 percent of the male beginning teachers aspired to becoming a school administrator, in contrast with 9 percent of the single women, 8 percent of the married women and 19 percent of the widowed, separated, and divorced women (cited in 72: 240-241). Whatever the motives, teachers often express satisfaction with their teaching position (88:36) or they are reluctant to accept the additional responsibilities of administration (cited in 88:35-37; 44:65). Warwick's study revealed that most women were content with their present position whether in teaching or administration while the men were not (cited in 88:36). Studies by Mas, Burns and Barter also indicated that women teachers were not interested in moving to higher status positions (cited in 88:35-37). From a sample of prospective women teachers, McMillin reported that as the level of the organization increased, women indicated they were less likely to accept the leadership role (44:65). Thus, women tend to

place limitations on themselves in the administrative hierarchy (85:6).

Advanced Training. The concentration of men in leadership positions can also be accounted for by the fact that men are more likely than women to receive the advanced training required for administration positions. There is evidence to support the hypothesis that women are not preparing for administrative positions to the extent that men do. Although women have improved their credentials, with a large increase in B.A.'s and small increase in master's degrees, men continue to have superior academic qualifications (55:11). These advanced degrees are the key to administrative positions and higher salaries and women are not showing much willingness to prepare for them.

Even if one accepts the proposition that women teachers lack the ambition to improve their professional qualifications, the key issue then is, why . . . and what can be done to overcome the barriers to their professional advancement. The proportion of women receiving graduate degrees is less today than in 1930 (47:2). The sharp decline in the percentage of women in institutions of higher education has been attributed to: 1) higher admission standards for women; 2) less financial aid for women than men; 3) negative attitudes on the part of campus counselors and professors toward women as professionals; 4) lack of campus services (child-care and abortion counseling); 5) male bias in the curriculum; (67) and, 6) the lack of female role models. In addition, there is some indication that women's increased educational attainment will not result in improved job opportunities in the future (63:11-12).

As long as women feel incapable, or for other reasons do not aspire to positions of responsibility, nor to the necessary professional training, they will not seek professional advancement. Likewise, even those women

who have the desire and ability to meet great challenges are reluctant because they would be wasting their time, money, and effort (31). "Thus, there exists a vicious circle in which discrimination against women and the sometimes valid basis for it reinforce each other. Their competing family roles and expectation that they will be discriminated against reduce women's performance and aspirations. They are then discriminated against partly because they are thought to lack ambition" (72:230).

Recruitment Procedures

Teachers are not usually encouraged to prepare for or apply for administrative positions (cited in 88:5). Those responsible for selecting administrators do not look for, recommend, or choose women for these assignments. Dreeban points out that promotion should rest on consideration of competence and impartiality; but no method currently exists for establishing a teacher's competence (15:175). (For an example of how negative attitudes toward women are not consciously recognized in this procedure, see Figure 1.) In the absence of valid criteria for predicting satisfactory administrative performance, administrators often rely on informal, social modes to recruit people. Women are on an unequal footing with men in terms of the kinds of informal contacts which may be necessary to insure advancement in a career. As in other occupations, the "buddy" system operates to the disadvantage of women teachers.

Negative Image of Administrators and "Career"

Our discussion of the reasons women are not promoted to positions of leadership would be incomplete without mentioning that many women simply do not aspire to positions of leadership in education because of the negative image of the school administrator (77:60). Anderson makes the point that

the negative image of the school administrator is a reflection of the present administrator (middle-class male) and his lack of classroom experience. He argues that there is a need to cast an image of the administrator as a person who is willing to take initiative and responsibility for up-grading the entire educational process before minority and non-middle class women *and* men will be attracted to positions of educational leadership (1:50).

Slater argues that few women want a career as it is defined in American society--nor would most men if they could only admit it (cited in 66:178).

> When we say "career" it connotates a demanding, rigorous, pre-ordained life pattern, to whose goals everything else is ruthlessly subordinated--everything pleasurable, human, emotional, bodily, frivolous . . . . Thus when a man asks a woman if she wants a career, it is intimidating. He is saying, are you willing to suppress half of your being as I am, neglect your family as I do, exploit personal relationships as I do, renounce all personal spontaneity as I do? Naturally, she shudders a bit and shuffles back to the broom closet (quoted in 66:178).

As long as a career continues to be defined as an all-consuming full-time commitment, many women will not seek the few opportunities available. It is a rare person, woman or man, who is able to handle a responsible administrative position without being threatened by its dehumanizing aspects (24: 172). Thus many women, for a variety of reasons, are unwilling to make the sacrifice necessary that a career approach to education involves.

At the present time there is an elaborate education system which teaches women to underestimate themselves. Role expectations, peer group pressures, the media, parental training, the lack of role-models (not seeing women in positions of authority)--all train the woman to know her place (4). Social practices which reinforce dependency, passivity, and non-assertiveness in girls combined with the "better dead than unwed" ideology teach a woman to pursue a husband, not a career. Branching out from home-

based activities takes her into a man's world, often in direct competition with men. Since a woman's traditional concept of her "femininity" is built around her roles as wife and mother, if she does decide to work, she may feel "aggressive" and "unfeminine." She often resolves the conflict by tying herself to a dead-end job rather than channeling her energies into a career, since she feels her primary responsibility is to her home. Women are often unwilling or find it difficult to relinquish their traditional concept of the good feminine life. They subordinate or extinguish their own goals and purposes for the sake of others (e.g., husband and children). The demands of family and home limit a woman's opportunities for advancement (65). So do 20 years of socialization which prevent women from thinking of themselves in positions of authority. So long as our socialization practices, society's concept of the female sex role, the traditional family structure, and the masculine definition of work remain unchanged, women will be less likely than men to aspire to, prepare for, and assume positions of leadership.

Recommendations for Remedial Action

For State and Local School Boards

Based on an analysis of sex inequities in recruitment, selection, promotion, salaries, rank, fringe benefits, and employment conditions, teachers, parents, and administrators are urged to make the following recommendations for remedial action to their local school districts:

1. Issue a formal statement opposing discrimination on the basis of sex.

2. Examine and revise written and unwritten policies which support, directly and indirectly, discriminatory practices, including maternity and parenthood leave policies, equal pay, fringe benefits, and retirement plans.

3. Examine the absolute and relative status of the women in comparison to the men so as to provide a basis for affirmative action plans.*

4. Establish annual goals and timetables for the recruitment, selection, salary and rank inequities, and conditions of employment. In areas were one sex is under-utilized use preferential hiring so as to work towards the elimination of sex-typing between and within occupations. Women should be actively recruited for positions generally closed to them, e.g., superintendent, high school math teacher.

5. Establish a committee responsible for monitoring, evaluating, and reporting the progress of the affirmative action plans.

6. Publish an annual progress report showing the number of men and women holding school-related jobs at each level of rank and salary.

7. Agree upon and make available to staff members the procedure for channeling complaints of discrimination by sex.

8. Provide in-service training sessions for administrators, teachers, and non-certified staff on stereotyped attitudes and practices to raise level of awareness of sex discrimination.

---

*Affirmative Action is the method used by an employer to assure that positive steps have been and will continue to be taken to achieve equal employment opportunities (21:1).

9. Actively recruit, encourage, and recommend those female teachers for administrative posts who seem to have the necessary qualifications for effective leadership of the schools.

10. Design and implement an on-the-job internship program which would provide women with the training to develop the skills necessary for administrative positions (85:18).

11. Provide part-time career opportunities at all levels of employment in all subject areas without loss of professional status and fringe benefits, and easy transition between part-time and full appointments for both men and women.

12. Allow for flexible work schedules for men and women, if they so request (34:169).

13. Establish child-care programs (with costs according to ability to pay) and a reference file of available child-caretakers and centers for children of staff, faculty, and students. These programs can be used for training students in child-care and other related courses.

For Colleges of Education

Sexism in the schools and society must be publicly recognized as a problem of the teaching profession and should become a special area of concern in schools of education. So as to interrupt the process by which sex-stereotyping is perpetuated by teachers, units or whole courses on what is known about discriminatory policies and practices in the schools should enter the college curriculum. Colleges of education are further urged to:

1. Encourage the development of methodologies and materials for implementing a non-sexist curriculum in the schools.

2. Actively seek and encourage female graduate students to prepare for and accept the challenge of administrative positions in education.

3. Encourage the reevaluation of university admission and financial-aid policies, career-counseling and other campus services which do not provide equitable support for women.

4. Explore and implement alternative means for certification as a school administrator, such as on-the-job internship program (see recommendation #8). Women with family responsibilities often find it impossible to meet the requirements of specified course work to be taken on campus within a limited time period.

5. Encourage placement offices to identify the employment of women in leadership positions in education as a priority and to publicize this commitment to all prospective employers (40:122).

Conclusions

Teaching is not expected to be a rapidly expanding occupation in the near future. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics occupational demand estimates (both sexes combined) for 1980, kindergarten and elementary school teaching careers are expected to expand by only 3.3 percent between 1968 and 1980. Secondary schoolteaching is expected to grow by about 14 percent in the same period (63:11).* The fastest growing occupations are professional and technical, the ones requiring the most educational preparation. The demand for all professional workers is expected to increase by 50 percent by 1980 (38:196). Because of the low birth rate during the Depression, people in the typical management age groups (30-55) are in short supply. Already shortages of capable school administrators are becoming critical in some areas of the United States (13:125). The question is *will women share equally in the expanded opportunities for professional careers or continue to be clustered in the low-paying, helper roles in which they predominate today?* In the coming years, if educators do not begin using the untapped and underutilized leadership abilities of women, the outcome is predictable. "At a time when good and perhaps great leadership is needed in education, the goal of leadership development must be expanded to include women or we must all learn to live with the mediocrity which is certain to result from a restricted source of leadership talent" (13:125).

---

*However, if present trends in education continue (e.g., free schools, on-the-job training, extended school year, retraining of adults) an *increase* and a *shift* in demand may occur, invalidating all current projected estimates of the demand for teachers.

The outlook for women will also improve when women, themselves, feel the need to expand the dimensions of what it means to be a person and a woman at the same time. As women become more positive in their attitudes toward their own abilities and those of other women, they will be more willing to develop their potential so they may assume responsibility for exercising leadership and judgment.

Escape from a prescribed role is painfully difficult. But it is essential if women want to make their own career choices, and if they are to be hired and promoted not on the basis of their sex, but rather on the basis of their interests and skills. Women will need to join in support of each other as they pressure local school districts and use legal procedures to attain equal employment and promotion opportunities. Existing local and national educational organizations and human rights groups can be vehicles for attaining these goals.

The school, as a microcosm of American society, functions, consciously and unconsciously, to reinforce the sex prejudice and discrimination increasingly recognized as widespread in our society. In its traditional role as an agent of socialization, the schools contribute to a selecting and sorting process that perpetuates the status quo. The relationship between education and society is reciprocal: to eradicate inequality in our society, we need to change our schools. Historically, public schools have invariably been followers in change rather than leaders of it. Nevertheless, the schools *can* and *should* serve as a major vehicle of social change in our society. Will the schools take the lead? The issue is whether long and antagonistic battles will be required to change discriminatory employment polices and practices in education or whether educational leaders themselves will voluntarily intervene in the process of perpetuating existing power differences.

The main policy implication is that although educational reform is essential for improving the status of women teachers, schools *alone* cannot contribute significantly to the equality of the sexes. If we want equality in our society, we will have to get it by changing our economic, political, and social institutions. Public policy must remove the barriers to opportunity that prevent women from realizing their full potential. These include not only the obstacles resulting from conflicts with occupational sex-typing, primarily discriminatory practices, but also the major barrier, the sex division of labor within the family (5). Public policy must help women who want to mesh their career with marriage and a family, by providing whatever services, including child-care, are necessary. The goal of policy should be to facilitate a division of labor that reflects the interests, capabilities, and potential of women *and* men. Such policy would work in the direction of making self-actualization and equality possible for everyone regardless of sex.

References

1. Anderson, Donald P. 1965. Recruiting leaders for tomorrow's schools. The National Elementary Principal, 44:47-50.

2. Association of American Colleges, Project on the Status and Education of Women. January 1973. Child-bearing and child-rearing leaves of absence. Washington, D.C.: Author. Mimeographed.

3. Association of American Colleges, Project on the Status and Education of Women. February 1973. Employment policies regarding pregnancy, maternity and childbirth. Washington, D.C.: Author.

4. Bem, Sandra L. and Bem, Daryl J. 1973. Training the woman to know her place: the social antecedents of women in the world of work. Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

5. Bernard, Jessie. 1971. Women and the public interest. New York: Aldine-Atherton, Inc.

6. Bowlby, John et al. (Eds.). 1966. Maternal care and mental health. New York: Schoken Books.

7. Broadhead, Clare et al. 1966. Going the way of the buffalo? The National Elementary Principal, 55(5):7-13.

8. Carroll, Mary A. 1972. Women in administration in higher education. Contemporary Education, 43:214-218.

9. Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women. November 1970. Job-related maternity benefits. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, Room 4211.

10. Connecticut Education Association. October 1972. Extra-pay for athletic and non-athletic activities in Connecticut teacher contracts 1971-1972. Research Bulletin R 72-28. Hartford, Conn.: Author.

11. Cook County Schools, Department of Research and Statistics. 1972. Comparative data regarding male and female administrators in the suburban schools of Cook County. Unpublished research report. Richard J. Martwick, Superintendent, 33 West Grand Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

12. Coyle, Irvin F. 1960. What's happening in teacher selection? Phi Delta Kappan, 41:291-293.

13. Dale, Charlene T. 1973. Women are still missing persons in administrative and supervisory jobs. Educational Leadership, 31(2):123-127.

14. Davis, Hazel et al. 1963. Economic, legal, and social status of teachers. Review of Educational Research, 33(4):398-414.

15. Dreeban, Robert. 1970. The nature of teaching. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman.

16. Eastwood, Mary. 1971. The double standard of justice. Valparaiso University Law Review, 5:281-317.

17. Epstein, Cynthia F. 1971. Woman's place. Berkeley: University of California Press.

18. Epstein, Cynthia F. 1972. Sex role stereotyping, occupations and social exchange. Paper prepared for conference on Women: Resource for a Changing World, April 17-18, sponsored by the Radcliff Institute, Radcliff College, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

19. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. April 5, 1972. Guidelines on discrimination because of sex. Federal Register, 37(6835).

20. Fields, Rona. (Undated, but probably 1972). Public education: training for sexism. Reprint available from KNOW, Inc., P.O. Box 86031, Pittsburgh, Pa.

21. Foxley, Cecelia H. 1974. Designing public school affirmative action programs. Background paper prepared for conference on Women in Educational Policy-Making. January 23-26, Denver, Colorado, sponsored by the Institute for Educational Leadership, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

22. Friedan, Betty and West, Anne Grant. October 1971. Sex bias: the built-in mentality that maims the public schools. American School Board Journal, 159:16-20.

23. Goodbye, mandatory maternity leave. 1972. Nation's Schools, 90(4): 10-15.

24. Graham, Patricia A. 1973. Status transitions of women students, faculty, and administrators. In Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood (Eds.), Academic women on the move. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

25. Gross, Edward. 1968. Plus ça change . . . ? The sexual structure of occupations over time. Social Problems, 16(2):198-208.

26. Gutwillig, Jacqueline G. 1973. Job-related maternity benefits. Unpublished speech for the Kentucky Hospital Personnel Association, Louisville, Kentucky, April 16-18. Washington, D.C.: Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, U.S. Department of Labor.

27. Haggerty, Betsy. May 24, 1973. Teacher battles principal and board. Westsider, 148 West 24th Street, New York, New York.

28. Hare, Norma Q. 1966. The vanishing woman principal. The National Elementary Principal, 45(5):12-13.

29. Hayghe, Howard. April 1973. Labor force activity of married women. Special Labor Force Report No. 153. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (reprint #2879 from the Monthly Labor Review).

30. Heyns, Barbara. 1972. Down the up staircase: sex roles, professionalization, and the status of teachers. In Scarvia B. Anderson (Ed.), Sex differences and discrimination in education. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company.

31. Heyns, Barbara and Luker, Kristin. August 1973. Women and inequality: a reassessment. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York, N.Y.

32. Holm, Jeanne M. 1970. Employment and women: Cinderella is dead. National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 34(1):6-13.

33. Holstrom, Lynda L. 1970. Career patterns of married couples. In Athena Theodore (Ed.), The professional women. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1971.

34. Holstrom, Lynda L. 1972. The two-career family. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company.

35. Hooker, Clifford P. 1973. The supply and demand of public school administrators. Administrative Leadership, 8(2).

36. Knezevich, Stephen J. (Ed.). 1971. The American school superintendent. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators.

37. Koontz, Elizabeth D. 1971. Childbirth and child rearing leave: job-related benefits. New York Law Forum, 17(2):480-502.

38. Koontz, Elizabeth D. 1972. A new look at education for girls. Contemporary Education, 43:195-197.

39. Lattanzio, Dominic R. 1973. Our schools today. Professional Personnel Report 1972-1973. Harrisburgh, Pa.: Division of Educational Statistics, Pennsylvania Department of Education.

40. Lyon, Catherine D. and Saario, Terry N. 1973. Women in public education: sexual discrimination in promotions. Phi Delta Kappan, 55(2):120-123.

41. McAulay, Mary. 1972. Sex discrimination in New York City public schools. Unpublished report for the New York City Commission on Human Rights. Teachers United for Fair Treatment (TUFT), 322 Central Park West, New York, N.Y.

42. McAulay, Mary. Summer 1973. McAuley vs. Board of Education: if you want to be a test case . . . . Women's Studies Newsletter. Old Westbury, N.Y.: The Feminist Press.

43. McCune, Shirley. 1970. Thousands reply to opinionnaire; many document cases of sex discrimination. American Association of University Women Journal, 63(4):202-205.

44. McMillin, Marvin R. 1972. Professional leadership aspirations of prospective women teachers. Spate, 10:63-70.

45. Mickish, G. January 1971. Can women function as successfully as men in the role of elementary principal? Research Report in Educational Administration, 4(2). Boulder, Col.: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Colorado.

46. Morsink, Helen M. September 1969. Leader behavior of men and women secondary school principals. Washington, D.C.: Reprint from the National Council of Administrative Women in Education.

47. National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, Office of Scientific Personnel. May 1973. Doctorate recipients from United States universities. Summary Report 1972. Publication OSP-MS 7. Washington, D.C.: Author.

48. National Council of Administrative Women in Education. 1965. Wanted: more women in educational leadership. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

49. National Council of Administrative Women in Education. 1973. Wanted more women: where are the women superintendents? Washington, D.C.: Author.

50. National Council of Administrative Women in Education. September 1973. NCAWE News, 21(1). Arlington, Va.: Author.

51. National Education Association, Du Shane Emergency Fund Division. 1971. Discriminating against the pregnant teacher. Today's Education, 60: 33-35.

52. National Education Association, Press, Radio, and Television Relations. January 21, 1974. High court strikes down mandatory teacher maternity leave in two NEA-backed cases. NEA News, Washington, D.C.: Author. Mimeographed.

53. National Education Association, Research Division, Report 1965-R13. What teachers think: a summary of teacher opinion poll findings, 1960-1965. Washington, D.C.: Author.

54. National Education Association, Research Division, Report 1971-R13. Estimates of school statistics, 1971-1972. Washington, D.C.: Author.

55. National Education Association, Research Division, Report 1972-R3. Status of the American public school teacher, 1970-1971. Washington, D.C.: Author.

56. National Education Association, Research Division, Report 1973-R4. Financial status of the public schools, 1973. Washington, D.C.: Author.

57. National Education Association, Research Division, Report 1973-R5. 26th biennial salary and staff survey of public-school professional personnel, 1972-73. Washington, D.C.: Author.

58. National Education Association, Research Division, Report 1973-R8. Estimates of school statistics, 1973-74. Washington, D.C.: Author.

59. National Education Association, Research Division. July 1973. Status of teachers and NEA members. Washington, D.C.: Author.

60. National Foundation for Improvement of Education, Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education. September 4, 1973. Research Action Notes, 1(2). Washington, D.C.: Author.

61. New York City Board of Education, Office of Personnel. October 30, 1972. Sex of public school professional personnel by professional field, 1971-72. Mimeographed.

62. Nolte, M. Chester. 1973. This one's even tougher: pregnant teachers obliterating school board maternity policies. American School Board Journal, 160:28-30.

63. Oppenheimer, Valerie K. 1972. Occupational opportunities for women. Paper prepared for conference on Women: Resource for a Changing World, April 17-18, sponsored by the Radcliff Institute, Radcliff College, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

64. Perrella, Vera C. February 1968. Women and the labor force. Special Labor Force Report No. 93. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (reprint #2560 from the Monthly Labor Review).

65. Poloma, Margaret M. and Garland, T. Neal. 1971. The married professional woman: a study in the tolerance of domestication. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33(3):531-540.

66. Prather, Jane. 1971. Why can't women be more like men: a summary of the sociopsychological factors hindering women's advancement in the professions. American Behavioral Science, 15(2):172-183.

67. Roby, Pamela. 1973. Institutional barriers to women students in higher education. In Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood (Eds.) Academic women on the move. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

68. Saario, Terry N. et al. August 1973. Sex role stereotyping in the public schools. Harvard Educational Review, 43(3):386-413.

69. Sandler, Bernice. March 12, 1973. Why women need less pay (and other myths). The Chronicle of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges. Mimeographed.

70. Schab, Fred. 1968. Women preparing to teach. In Athena Theodore (Ed.), The professional woman. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1971.

71. Sexton, Patricia C. 1969. The feminized male. New York: Vintage Books.

72. Simpson, Richard L. and Simpson, Ida H. 1969. Women and bureaucracy in the semi-professions. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), The semi-professions and their organization. New York: Free Press.

73. Sinowitz, Betty E. December 1972. New legal remedies for women. Today's Education, 61(0):29-31.

74. Sipser, Margaret. 1973. Maternity leave: judicial and arbitral interpretation. Labor Law Journal, 24(3):173:190.

75. Stern, Marjorie and Kaye, Nancy. (Undated, but probably 1973.) A guide for improving maternity leave, or pregnancy, childbirth, and child rearing leave contract clauses. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers.

76. Suelzle, Marijean. May 29, 1970. A national perspective on women in the labor force. In Rebecca Mills et al. (Eds.), Women and the personnel office at UCB. The Wright Institute Report. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California, December 1970.

77. Suelzle, Marijean. 1973. Sexism in American schools? Yes . . . but . . . . Learning, 1:60-61.

78. Taylor, Suzanne S. 1971. The attitudes of superintendents and board of education members in Connecticut toward the employment and effectiveness of women as public school administrators. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.

79. Taylor, Suzanne S. 1972. Educational leadership: a male domain. Phi Delta Kappan, 55(2):124-128.

80. U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. 1966. College women seven years after graduation: resurvey of women graduates, class of 1957. In Athena Theodore (Ed.), The professional woman. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1971.

81. U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. 1971. (rev.) Why women work. Washington, D.C.: Author. Mimeographed.

82. Walker, Lenore. 1973. Women's rights in education: the study of sex discrimination in the New Jersey public schools. Unpublished report for the New Jersey Women's Equity Action League, 14 Tunica Court, Old Bridge, New Jersey.

83. Watley, Donivan J. 1969. Career or marriage?: a longitudinal study of able young women. In Athena Theodore (Ed.), The professional woman. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1971.

84. Women's Equity Action League. August 8, 1973. Unpublished report on sex discrimination in Richland School District One. Colombia, S.C.: Author, P.O. Box 5853.

85. The Women's Rights Committee. 1973. The time is now. Report A. Dayton, Ohio: Dayton Public Schools.

86. The Women's Rights Committee. 1973. Choices. Report B. Dayton, Ohio: Dayton Public Schools.

87. Ziegler, Harmon. 1967. Male and Female: differing perceptions of the teaching experience. In Athena Theodore (Ed.), The professional woman. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1971.

88. Zimmerman, Jeanne N. 1971. The status of women in educational-administrative positions in central offices of public schools. Ed.D. dissertation, Temple University.

Tables and Figures

TABLE 1

TOTAL NUMBER OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, AND PERCENT OF MEN TEACHERS

Year	Total	Men	Women	% of Men Teachers
1	2	3	4	
1869-70	200,515	77,529	122,986	38.7%
1879-80	286,592	122,795	163,789	42.8
1889-90	363,922	125,525	238,397	34.5
1899-1900	423,062	126,588	296,474	29.9
1909-10	523,210	110,481	412,729	21.1
1919-20	679,302	95,654	583,648	14.1
1929-30	854,263	141,771	712,492	16.6
1939-40	875,477	194,725	680,752	22.2
1941-42	858,888	183,194	675,694	21.3
1943-44	827,990	126,672	701,318	15.3
1944-45	826,373	127,102	699,271	15.4
1945-46	831,026	138,209	692,817	16.6
1946-47	833,512	153,297	680,215	18.4
1947-48	860,678	161,913	698,765	18.8
1948-49	878,804	172,720	706,084	19.7
1949-50	913,671	194,968	718,968	21.3
1950-51	944,036	214,966	729,070	22.8
1951-52	963,000	235,000	728,000	24.4
1953-54	1,032,138	253,518	778,620	24.6
1955-56	1,133,093	294,170	838,923	26.0
1957-58	1,237,849	331,663	906,186	26.8
1959-60	1,354,958	392,670	962,288	29.0
1961-62	1,457,964	436,575	1,021,389	29.9
1963-64	1,567,974	487,967	1,080,007	31.1
1965-66	1,710,888	543,768	1,167,120	31.8
1967-68	1,863,967	587,808	1,276,159	31.5
1969-70	2,008,432*	652,586*	1,355,846*	32.5*
1970-71	2,062,243*	677,268*	1,384,975*	32.8*
1971-72	2,086,201*	693,738	1,392,463*	33.1*
1972-73	2,108,846*	704,325*	1,404,521*	33.4*
1973-74	2,124,150*	718,014*	1,406,136*	33.8*

Source: 1869-70 through 1969-68--Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare; 1969-70, 1970-71, 1971-72, and 1972-73--estimates of NEA Research Division (marked with asterisk); Figures for the years before 1969-60 do not include Alaska and Hawaii. (Data from National Education Association, Research Division, April 1973.)

47

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FEMALE TEACHERS BY POSITION AND REGION, 1972-1973

	Dayton	Richland One	Pennsylvania	New Jersey	National
Elementary Teachers	80.5	91	80.3	85.6	83.5
Secondary Teachers	42.3	67	40.8	43.8	46.4

Sources: Dayton (85:2); Richland One (84: Table 1); Pennsylvania (39:22); New Jersey (82: Table 1); National (58:29).

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS BY SEX, 1972-1973

	Male	Female
Principals		
Elementary	80.4	19.6
Junior High	97.1	2.9
Senior High	98.6	1.4
Assistant Principals		
Elementary	69.2	30.8
Junior High	92.4	7.6
Senior High	93.6	6.4

Source: 57:9.

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS BY POSITION AND REGION

Position	Dayton 1973	Richland One 1972-1973	New York City 1971-1972	Minnesota 1971-1972	Pennsylvania 1972-1973	Kentucky 1972-1973	National 1972-1973
Superintendents	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.8	4.0	0.1
Assistant Superintendents	0.0	0.0	28.0	0.0	2.7	---	5.3
Elementary Principals	23.1	42.0	27.2	18.2	16.0	15.0	19.6
Assistant Elementary Principals	25.0	22.0[b]	48.4	21.3	14.3	19.0	30.8
Junior High Principals	0.0[a]	---	21.2	---	---	---	2.9
Assistant Junior High Principals	30.0	---	19.9	---	---	---	7.6
Senior High Principals	0.0	0.0	8.6	0.5	2.2	2.0	1.4
Assistant Senior High Principals	21.7	---	23.9	3.5	4.9	4.0	6.4
Elementary Teachers	80.5	91.0	82.1	81.0[c]	80.3	84.0	83.5
Secondary Teachers	42.3	67.0	---	65.0	40.8	55.0	46.4

Source: Dayton (86:4); Richland One (84); New York City (61:1); Minnesota (35:11); Pennsylvania (39:6); Kentucky figures from correspondence with Lyman V. Ginger, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Instruction, Frankfort, Kentucky, December 11, 1973; National (57:9; 58:29).

[a]Data on Dayton are based on Middle School statistics.

[b]Data on Richland One based on system-wide statistics for assistant principals.

[c]Data based on 1974 estimates from Mary Tjosvold, Women's Educational Action Group, 3204 Minnehaha Avenue, South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55406.

ORGANIZATION, ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION

The Post-Observation Conference and the Written Report

I. The Post-Observation Conference

A. To help the teacher analyze his work

B. To help the teacher plan for growth

C. To praise him for good features of the lesson

D. To discuss definite plans for overcoming weaknesses

E. To establish a friendly and cooperative supervisor-teacher relationship

F. To allow for a free discussion in which the teacher feels free to ask questions and to offer counter suggestions as they are warranted.

G. Technique of the conference

1. Time and place: not immediately, but don't postpone too long (allow time for reflection). Teacher's room often better than chairman's office.

2. Length: not too long.

3. Atmosphere: teacher and chairman to be relaxed; teacher to be asked to talk about the class, the pupils, special problems and difficulties.

4. Start conference by asking teacher to evaluate what he did in terms of his aims, whether he would teach the lesson in the same way again or whether he would modify it. How would he modify it?

5. Chairman not to talk too much; should be a "give and take" affair.

6. Teacher never to be humiliated, no matter how wrong she may be.

7. If there is a difference of opinion, chairman is to be tactful but should insist that his suggestion be given a fair trial.

8. The conference should end pleasantly.

Fig. 1. This official Board of Education literature is used to train supervisors. (Data from Office of Personnel, New York City.)

About the Author

Suzanne Howard received her B.A. and M. of Ed. degrees from Wayne State University, and her Ph.D. in Comparative Education from the University of Michigan. She has also taught or served as a research assistant at the University of Kentucky, University of Michigan and the University of Nantes in France. As a student and assistant professor, Dr. Howard received numerous grants and fellowships. Prior to her field work in France on secondary school youth and teacher roles in Lebanon, she taught French in the public schools of Detroit, Michigan.

Dr. Howard is a member of the National Council of Administrative Women in Education, Phi Delta Kappa, the National Organization for Women, the Federation of Organizations for Professional Women and is currently serving as a member of the Board of Directors of the Comparative and International Education Society. She has authored several articles and prepared a handbook of women's studies course materials for teacher educators entitled, *Liberating Our Children, Ourselves*. She has been a consultant to state and national educational organizations concerned with combatting sexism in the schools and has developed materials for and participated in many panels and workshops on sex roles and education.

Dr. Howard is now the assistant director of Program for Corporate Member Relationships at the national headquarters of the American Association of University Women, Washington, D.C.